

**REMARKS**

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated December 3, 2004.

The Examiner objected to the Abstract. The specification has been amended to include a replacement Abstract that addresses the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner objected to the numbering of the claims because of two claims duplicately numbered 81. Misnumbered claims 81-85 have been renumbered 82-86. The amendments to renumber these misnumbered claims were not made to overcome prior art.

The Examiner rejected claims 29-86 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Christel et al. (hereinafter Christel). The Examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Christel. Christel first discloses a thumbnail presentation of video where a key frame is selected from each segment, each key frame being presented in the presentation. The thumbnail presentations of Christel do not anticipate any of applicant's claims because such thumbnail presentations (1) at best select and present one frame of a selected video segment and (2) does not include the claimed graphical user interface. Christel, however also discloses a system for presenting video skims in which a user may enter a query to which certain frames of a video are "matched." Given a plurality of matched frames, along with a user-selected compression ratio, the system automatically selects one or more video sequences to be presented in a summary, each sequence centered about a matched frame to be included in the summary. The system of Christel also includes a video scroll bar that shows the match locations and the selected portions of the video in the summary.

Independent claims 1, 29, and 56 have each been amended to include the limitation of “displaying said . . . location for a first type of content of said audio using a first visual indication and displaying said . . . location for a second type of content of said audio using a second visual indication different from said first visual indication.” This limitation was previously found in each of dependent claims 8, 35, and 57, respectively, which have been canceled. Christel does not disclose this limitation. The Examiner has contended that FIGS. 5 and 6 of Christel each show temporal information for respective “types of content.” The Examiner is incorrect. The difference between the displays shown in FIG. 5 and FIG. 6 simply reflects a different compression ratio selected by a user, and is not indicative of any content shown in the video. Moreover, the visual indications shown in these respective figures are identical, i.e. the same scroll bar shows the location of the segments playing in each of the 20% skim and the 40% skim, respectively. Hence, the second visual indication is not “different from said first visual indication” as claimed. Therefore, independent claims 1, 29, and 56, along with each of their respective dependent claims, are patentably distinguished over Christel and should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7, 8-34, 36-56, and 58-86.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kurt Rohlf  
Reg. No. 54,405  
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631